

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 31-35, 38, 39, 56-60, 63 and 64 are pending in this application. Claims 10, 13-30, 36, 37, 40-55, 61 and 62 have been cancelled. Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 31, 34, 35, 38, 39, 56, 59, 63 and 64 have been amended.

The Office Action objects to the drawings for failing to show reference numeral 10 and being of rough quality. Figures 1 and 2 have been corrected to obviate these objections.

*Substantive  
rejection  
3/10*

Applicants appreciate the opportunity provided by the Examiner on December 13, 2005 for the telephonic interview in which the below rejections were discussed. In accordance with that interview, Applicants have amended the claims to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants also provide the below arguments as to why the obviousness rejections should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects to claims 1-4, 6-8, 13, 31-34, 36, 40, 56-58, 60 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. The Office Action asserts that the claims lack sufficient structure or steps to reduce the transmission rates or impede UV transmission as claimed. This objection is moot as to claims 13, 36, 40 and 61, which have been cancelled. Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 31, 34, 35, 38, 39, 56, 63 and 64 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. In particular, the plurality of panels of the body of the nurser liner comprise an oxygen barrier, while the closure member is selectively resealable and connected to the plurality of panels of the nurser liner in order to provide the claimed reduced oxygen transmission rate.

The Office Action rejects claims 20, 25, 26, 28-30, 45, 50, 51 and 53-55 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Duckwall. This objection is moot as to claims 20, 25, 26, 28-30, 45, 50, 51 and 53-55, which have been cancelled.